| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|--|
| | 10/689,208 | SHUKLA ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Jyoti Chawla | 1761 |
| All Participants: Status of Application: Abandoned | | |
| (1) <u>Jyoti Chawla</u> . | (3) | |
| (2) <u>Timothy Fullin</u> . | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: 15 November 2006 | Time: | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: | | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: | | |
| Claims discussed: Prior art documents discussed: | | |
| Part II. | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER A telephone call was placed concerning the lack of action in rega representative that the applicant did not file a response in the cu | rds to the application and was info | |
| Part III. | | |
| ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary | e examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the | en summary of the substance interview, since the interview |
| ISISIS CANO | | |
| SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700 | | |
| | Applicant's Representative Si | gnature – if appropriate) |